

REF

Z

675.M4

N27B2L


1986

v.1

Report of the
Board of Regents

National Library of Medicine

Long Range Plan Executive Summary



U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Public Health Service
National Institutes of Health

Overview of the NLM Long Range Plan

Cover:

A system for quantitative DNA analysis using image processing

The NLM Long Range Plan is published as a series of 7 reports:

An *Executive Summary* sketches the background against which the Long Range Plan may be viewed, and it extracts highlights from the Board of Regents Report.

The *NLM Long Range Plan (Report of the Board of Regents)* presents detailed and specific recommendations and estimated resource requirements over the next 3 years for accomplishing the Library's long range goals.

Panel reports 1 through 5 contain the substance of the five advisory planning panels' discussion in each of the five principal domains of NLM activity:

Panel 1: Building and organizing the Library's collection

Panel 2: Locating and gaining access to medical and scientific literature


Panel 3: Obtaining factual information from data bases

Panel 4: Medical informatics

Panel 5: Assisting health professions education through information technology

Readers who wish further details should consult appropriate volumes in the series. Limited copies are obtainable from:

Office of Inquiries and Publications Management
National Library of Medicine
8600 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, MD 20894
(301)496-6308



**Report of the
Board of Regents**

National Library of Medicine

Long Range Plan Executive Summary

Foreword

Z
675.M4
N2782L
1986
v.1

It has been my privilege to serve on the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine (NLM) from 1982 to 1986. Succeeding Dr. Martin Cummings, Dr. Donald Lindberg began as the NLM Director in August 1984, the same month I began as Chairman of the Board of Regents. In our early informal talks together, Dr. Lindberg and I shared a belief in the importance of the NLM and the need for this great institution to prepare for its role in the changing scene of American medicine and science. The Library's distinguished history reflects its evolution as the world's greatest repository of biomedical information. Further, the Library staff has continually searched for ways to make its sources more available to scientists, clinicians and the public. Without question, the National Library of Medicine has become the intellectual center of the world's biomedical information network. To continue that role, some changes in mission and operations would be necessary.

In these early discussions, Dr. Lindberg and I agreed that the Library could best plan its future activities and resource requirements only after a careful examination of its mission and the requirements of its users. The new and different realities of the 21st century are coming into focus and changes to accommodate this new world are inevitable. At the direction of the Board of Regents a long range planning project was organized. It was presented to the Regents at the June 1985 meeting, and received their enthusiastic endorsement.

Consultants were identified, panels appointed, and the project launched in the Fall of 1985. The marvelous efforts of the panel members enabled each group to generate a report with recommendations. I believe that every user population was represented in the discussions held during the several meetings of the five panels and nothing overlooked in the long range plan.

This plan is intended to serve the public, the Congress, the HHS Secretary, future regents and the Director of NLM and staff in their decision making about the Library's future activities. Public and private financial support will be necessary to underwrite these enormously important functions. It is my hope that the plan and its interrelated component parts will be made known to the Secretary and the Congress and will help those leaders understand and appreciate the National Library of Medicine. Further, support from the private sector may be desirable for certain activities and the plan should help identify such areas.

In developing the plan, the Regents have been ably assisted by the Library staff and, particularly, its Director. The Board of Regents enthusiastically supports the plan and will help to encourage its successful implementation

L. Thompson Bowles, M.D., Ph.D.
Dean for Academic Affairs
Professor of Surgery
The George Washington University
Medical Center
Chair
Board of Regents
National Library of Medicine
1985-1986

Preface

850549
870407
MG
DIR

The responsibility of the National Library of Medicine is to 'assist the advancement of medical and related sciences, and to aid in the dissemination and exchange of scientific and other information important to the progress of medicine and to the public health.' The Library had done this well in the past. Yet rapid changes in science, in health care practices, in the uses of information technology, and in American public policy concerning all these issues bring us pause to re-study how best to fulfill our responsibility during the coming decades.

This Report embodies a central challenge to the National Library of Medicine to strive to be certain that health care in America and the advancement of biomedical research toward this end will benefit from the dazzling technological discoveries that are available to us now from computer and information science, telecommunications engineering, physics and chemistry. In the past, the Library has established a distinguished record of scholarly leadership in medicine. This Report emphasizes the present urgent need for improved access by health care professionals and scientists to the fast growing scientific literature of newly discovered biomedical concepts, treatments, and preventatives—across a wide range of practical and theoretical problems. The most encouraging aspect of this Report is the recommendation that the Library move as quickly as possible to translate the existing "raw" technology of computers, information, and engineering sciences into products and services that through its insight and understanding of the special biomedical practices and needs can improve health care in America.

No one doubts that even finer developments await us in the coming years. Yet even today there exist outside of medicine, advanced systems for knowledge representation, country-wide inquiry and communication, and decision support for military, financial, industrial, and intelligence applications. What seems needed now is to adapt these general and useful technologies to the specific jobs of biomedicine. Progress might eventually come in any case, but a concerted effort on the part of the National Library of Medicine could speed this up, bringing laboratory advances and discoveries closer to the bedside and the clinic.

A word must be said about priorities among the current, the enhanced, and the new activities that this Report recommends. It does not prescribe a fixed sequence of steps by which the entire plan and all its objectives are to be accomplished. The construction of a functioning operational plan will be developed by NLM and its Board of Regents within resource limitations. This Report is more a map for the future and a set of opportunities that await NLM action and program development. The advisors and the Board of Regents are no doubt fully aware that the urgency of the need to support NLM's planned programs for the Nation's good must necessarily be balanced by the Congress and the Executive against all other needs for resources. In addition, many of the proposed programs are dependent upon full understanding and enthusiastic endorsement and support by the constituencies of the Library most affected.

Yet, the Report clearly recognizes several outstanding considerations. NLM's fundamental priority certainly is to sustain the collections of the Library and to provide better access; or, stated another way, to provide high quality library and information services to the biomedical community. Actions toward this goal include continued refinement of collections and preservation programs, improvements to the electronic system for end-user access, and modernization of our information support services.

The top priority for our discretionary efforts must be to prepare the Library and the Nation's health professionals for the optimal utilization of the burgeoning electronic technologies for knowledge management. Of the numerous initiatives the plan proposes as components of this preparation, one in particular stands out. This is the "window of opportunity" presented to the Library in the field of molecular biology and biotechnology. Attention to this opportunity—through the provision of advanced information handling services—will permit NLM to contribute significantly to discovery of new principles and treatments by health-care professionals and scientists.

As a direct result of the insight gained through the long range planning efforts embodied in this Report, NLM is already giving prime emphasis within the bounds of our current resources to research efforts to develop integrating and coordinating systems for the factual data bases in molecular biology/biotechnology. These efforts now involve a number of advanced techniques recommended in the Report, including extension of the Unified Medical Language System to molecular biology, interconnectivity of the existing data bases through electronic gateways and networks, and new knowledge representation designs.

I welcome the Report and its recommendations. On behalf of the National Library of Medicine staff, I wish to thank most sincerely all those who so graciously contributed their time, effort, and thoughts to this careful and salient statement.

Donald A.B. Lindberg, M.D.
Director, National Library of Medicine

Report of the Board of Regents


Foreword	2
Preface	3
Introduction	6
Background 7	
Origin of the Plan 8	
Goals and Recommendations	9
The NLM Collection 9	
Access to the Literature 10	
Factual Data Bases 12	
Medical Informatics 13	
Health Professions Education 14	
Resource Requirements	15
NLM Planning Process 19	
Participants in the Long Range Planning Process 21	

Introduction

This is an Executive Summary of the Long Range Plan of the NLM (National Library of Medicine), issued by its Board of Regents. The Plan is the product of a year-long process that drew upon the expertise of a broad range of health professionals, scientists, library and information experts, and other specialists. The full report represents a comprehensive plan for the Library as it approaches the twenty-first century.

The Plan is published as a series of reports. The Report of the Board of Regents presents detailed and specific recommendations and estimated resource requirements over the next 3 years for accomplishing the Library's long range goals. Panel reports 1 through 5 contain the substance of the five advisory planning panels' discussion in each of the five principal domains of NLM activity:

- 1 Building and Organizing the Library's Collection
- 2 Locating and Gaining Access to Medical and Scientific Literature
- 3 Obtaining Factual Information from Data Bases
- 4 Medical Informatics
- 5 Assisting Health Professions Education through Information Technology



This Executive Summary sketches the background against which the Long Range Plan may be viewed, and it extracts highlights from the Report of the Library's Board of Regents. Among the highlights are important new initiatives in biotechnology, preservation, medical informatics, networking, and a Unified Medical Language System. Also included in this summary are resource recommendations of the Board of Regents covering the first 3 year period of implementation of the Long Range Plan.

Readers who wish further details should consult the full Report of the Board as well as the reports of the five advisory panels.

The amount of information about the human body, its processes, and the threats to which it is exposed is truly staggering. Consider:

Three young boys are rushed to a hospital, victims of a lightning strike. Unsure of the best course, the resident quickly taps into MEDLINE to search for articles covering treatment of lightning injuries in children under the age of twelve. In fifteen minutes, the resident has a complete list of articles on burns and heart damage from lightning, which he credits with the timely and effective treatment of the three children.

There is scarcely a medical question that can be posited that does not have an answer in the medical literature. The answer may be incomplete; it may (and probably will) change as we learn more, but, nevertheless, information does exist to guide the health professional. The Nation's continuing investment in biomedical research ensures that the amount of this information will continue to expand rapidly.

The National Library of Medicine is mandated by law to acquire and preserve this information as it is embodied in the biomedical literature, to organize it so that it may be retrieved, and to disseminate the information so that it may advance the health of the American public. For more than 150 years it has labored to serve the varied needs of health practitioners, medical scientists, and students of the health sciences. From the *Index Medicus*, the first systematic classification of the world's medical literature (called by William Welch the greatest American contribution to medicine in the 19th century), to the development, almost a century later, of computerized data bases for rapidly retrieving information, the Library has been a leader in applying innovative methods to disseminate vitally needed health information.

The Library also engages in and supports research and development into new and more effective methods of information transfer. NASA satellites, microwave television, computer-based voice-recognition systems, video disks and compact disks, and artificial intelligence techniques are examples of the many technologies the Library has used to improve biomedical communications. A variety of health-related subjects have benefited from information systems developed by the Library: medical education, toxicology, handling hazardous materials, cancer research, population and reproduction, bioethics and health-care administration, to name a few.

Origin of the Plan

The Board of Regents is charged with advising the Secretary of Health and Human Services on important matters of policy affecting the Library. Mindful of this duty, the Board two years ago began to consider the Library's future in light of the increasingly important role of information in American medicine and science.

The Regents took note of the accelerated growth of the medical literature, the special challenges and opportunities presented by the scientific revolution in molecular biology, and the remarkable advances in electronic systems technology for storing and communicating information. Such trends, they concluded, present NLM with an opportunity to play an even greater role in improving the Nation's health by improving biomedical communications. Accordingly, the Regents requested that a long range strategy for the Library's future be devised, and they sought out the assistance of experts to develop it.

Physicians, nurses, dentists, veterinarians, librarians, editors, publishers, educators, and participants from industry, biomedical professional associations, information services, and health insurance companies enthusiastically responded to the call. This broad diversity of occupations and expertise reflects the constituencies of the Library and the variety of needs and interests it serves. More than one hundred outstanding individuals willingly gave their attention to the process. The Board of Regents is grateful for their wisdom and values their ideas for the Library's future.

The vision of the planners is both dazzling and simple. They posit nothing less than a nationwide system that will provide immediate, authoritative answers to questions posed by health professionals. Often these answers may come from systems based on the medical literature—either bibliographic or full text—but they may also come from knowledge bases, expert systems, or other computer-based and network-accessible collections of information.

The Board of Regents acknowledges that, although the Library's mandate clearly covers such a system, it would be wise for NLM to involve others in building it. The Library can provide the vision and leadership, but it will require broad collaboration among academic institutions, national and international organizations, professional societies, libraries, publishers, and computer hardware and software developers if such a goal is to be achieved.

The sections that follow briefly abstract the main features from the Board of Regents' Long Range Plan. The order follows a logical flow, from maintaining the collection, to improving access to literature-based information and factual data bases, to developing computerized medical question-answering and problem-solving systems, to using new technology to improve the education of health professionals.

Goals and Recommendations

The NLM Collection

The National Library of Medicine is the “library of record” for medicine and the allied health sciences. That is, NLM is responsible for assuring access to all significant information in biomedicine, by acquiring, organizing and preserving the published record of the health sciences. To make the information contained in this vast collection readily accessible, NLM catalogs and indexes the items required, describing and classifying their content using a thesaurus and classification specially developed for biomedicine.

The NLM collection serves as a backup for all U.S. biomedical libraries. The assurance that its comprehensive collection will be maintained and preserved allows other libraries to rely on NLM for items that are infrequently requested as well as for the long-term preservation of the scholarly record of biomedicine. This sharing of responsibility has saved millions of dollars nationally and results in rapid and effective service for the professions.

NLM must not only continue to collect the biomedical literature comprehensively, it must respond adaptively to two kinds of changes: in the subjects that are relevant to medicine, and in the physical format of the literature. The explosion of knowledge in molecular biology, for example, has provided new insights into the genetic bases of disease and made large blocks of basic biological science newly relevant to medicine. Correspondingly, the “literature” of genetic engineering is increasingly “published” in the form of electronic records that are accessible to desk-top computers. Ironically, at the same time the Library copes with new physical formats, preservation of the old—paper—becomes increasingly important. This is because of the inevitable deterioration of much of the paper used in publishing since the late nineteenth century.

Recommendations: The 9 specific recommendations of the Board of Regents related to Building and Organizing the Library’s Collection concern:

- The need to work with the producers of electronically published materials so that such material acquired for the collection will be manageable;
- Carrying out the recommendations of the NLM Preservation Plan to cope with the problem of deteriorating paper; and
- Improving NLM’s indexing and cataloging by using computer and artificial intelligence techniques, and enriching the bibliographic records created by NLM.




Access to the Literature

The world's greatest collection of biomedical literature is of little use if it is not accessible. The Nation's investment in medical research cannot be realized until the resulting information is effectively in the hands of the professional community. Today's technological advances present new opportunities for gaining access to medical information; its actual transfer is now less a physical than an electronic process. Libraries of the future will evolve into a powerful interlocking system of networks to bring together information resources and users.

For such a system to evolve fully, there are a number of issues that need resolution. How will the electronic data bases and "publications" be distributed, and under what arrangements will they be accessible? Libraries now subscribe to journals for a fixed fee, regardless of how many readers scan a particular article, whereas online information is typically sold by the hour and each user charged. Libraries buy whole books, even though most readers consult only a single chapter, but electronic "books" can be selectively copied from a host computer to a user's personal computer. Will books and journals be distributed on optical disks, magnetic tape, or some as yet undeveloped media? What standards and conventions will be adopted for updating the electronic information, and what safeguards will be in place to protect it from unauthorized insertions or deletions?

This section of the Long Range Plan approaches the question of access from two aspects: how to improve the organizational structure through which medical information is provided, and how to improve the information tools available to the individual user.



The primary points of focus for the former are the existing RML (Regional Medical Library) Network and the developing IAIMS (Integrated Academic Information Management Systems) program, both of which were created by NLM and receive Federal funding. The Plan calls for a wider integration of information resources and facilities to form a more extended infrastructure through which future services may be provided.

The RML Network, with its 4,000 members, is a remarkably successful example of inter-institutional cooperation for the public good, primarily for speedily providing copies of books and journal articles to health professionals. The Network offers an ideal test-bed for applying new communications technology and for developing new information delivery systems. The IAIMS projects, on the other hand, are primarily intra-institutional, being created within academic health centers. They hold out the promise of integrating into one system all significant sources of information within a complex academic medical enterprise.

Shifting from the institutional to the individual, the Long Range Plan emphasizes the needs of health care practitioners who require direct and convenient access to information. Before optimum "user-friendly" information tools and services can be created for health care professionals, however, the Library needs to know more about their information-seeking and information-using behavior. The Plan also addresses the role of health-science librarians and information specialists, and how this role must change with the changing technology. Finally, the increasing demand for health information on the part of the lay public is addressed. What is the responsibility of the National Library of Medicine for collecting, organizing, and disseminating popular health information?

Recommendations: The 16 specific recommendations of the Board of Regents related to Locating and Gaining Access to Medical and Scientific Literature concern:


- The need to continue support of the Regional Medical Library Network and the Integrated Academic Information Management Systems and to ensure that they adopt the best in modern communications technology;
- Developing connections ("interfaces") among bibliographic data bases so as to create a seamless network that may be accessed easily by health professionals;
- Developing more efficient systems for reference services, bibliographic searching, providing documents; and improving existing systems such as NLM's new GRATEFUL MED; and
- The Library's role in developing new educational programs for information professionals and the need to study NLM's role in providing health information to the public.

Factual Data Bases

Bibliographic data bases are pointers to information located elsewhere. Factual data bases contain the sought-after fact or, in the case of advanced “intelligent” systems, can calculate or derive the answer from stored data. The Library is concerned with three kinds of computerized factual data bases: those designed for the protection of the public health and environment; those that provide information of special interest to biomedical scientists; and those linked in some fashion to health care and practice.

Within the first category, the Library offers several factual data bases that describe the effects of chemical substances on humans, other biological systems, and the environment. The HSDB (Hazardous Substance Data Bank) is one such factual data base. It is clear that the Library should not be the sole provider of information about hazardous chemicals. However, multiple sources of information risk duplication of expensive efforts and are difficult to use effectively even by an experienced information specialist. As the Library’s factual data bases are used increasingly for responding to emergencies, it has become apparent that simplified access methods and improved means of validation and reliability testing are needed.

A prime example of the second category of factual data bases—those of interest to scientists—is the Report’s proposal that the Library take the lead in linking together data banks of genetic and molecular biology information. This whole area has come to be known as “biotechnology.” Because of the complexity of biological systems, the amount of molecular biology data at various levels—from cells and tissues through successively smaller genetic units—is enormous, and growing rapidly as a result of research. Enormous, too, however, are the potential benefits as scientists unravel the mysteries of the genetic code.



The third category—data bases for the practitioners—will become increasingly necessary for high quality medical care. There is a staggering amount of knowledge available to the health-care professional, and more is announced every day from the nation’s laboratories. The information with which every young physician is equipped on entering practice declines in validity with the passage of time. The Library already provides practitioners with direct and simple access to its major bibliographic data bases. Needed now are factual data bases of practice-linked information that may be joined with “reasoning” computer programs. These will result in knowledge-based systems to help physicians make diagnoses and to suggest treatment regimens.

Recommendations: The 11 recommendations of the Board of Regents related to Factual Data Bases concern the need for the Library to:

- Enhance the content and facilitate access to the HSDB and other factual data bases for public health and environmental protection;
- Establish services and linkages for biotechnology information; and
- Establish a collaborative program to develop data bases for medical practitioners.

Medical Informatics

Medical informatics studies biomedical information, data, and knowledge—their storage, retrieval, and optimal use for problem solving and decision making. The emergence of medical informatics as a new discipline is due not only to advances in technology, but to the awareness that knowledge is becoming unmanageable by traditional paper-based methods, and to a growing conviction that the *process* of decision making is as important as the factual base on which clinical decisions or research plans are made.

Processing information faster or more efficiently—which today's technology can easily accomplish—is not sufficient. What is needed are new and more powerful information management tools. These include (a) frameworks for organizing and encoding medical knowledge, (b) methods for acquiring and representing judgmental knowledge that is based on medical experience rather than formal studies, (c) computer networks to permit efficient communication among health personnel, and (d) systems to provide customized, expert advice to practitioners.

To accomplish this, the Report calls for the Library, through its Lister Hill Center, to conduct research and development that would be a significant component of the overall effort in medical informatics. Among the subjects of such research would be the development of a Unified Medical Language System (UMLS), and expert systems based on artificial-intelligence techniques. The UMLS, already begun by the Library, is an initiative of extreme importance that may lead the health professions out of today's bewildering maze of eclectic terminology that impedes the use of automated information systems. The Report also outlines the kind of research the Library would support in medical informatics with grants and contracts to other institutions.



Recommendations: The 10 specific recommendations of the Board of Regents related to Medical Informatics concern:

- The development by the Library, in collaboration with private and other Federal organizations, of a Unified Medical Language System;
- The need for NLM to support the building of expert systems and a prototype national communications system for research in medical informatics; and
- The support by NLM of "Centers of Excellence in Medical Informatics" and the expansion of its present grant program to conduct research and to train a cadre of experts in the field.

Health Professions Education

The amount of available medical information has long since expanded beyond the ability of any one person to master it all. One valid response to this information overload is to use modern technology to provide easy access to needed information. Students can be given fewer “facts” (likely as not soon to become outmoded) and more tools, so they may seek the latest information when confronted with a problem. Training with modern methods of information management during students’ formative years will greatly enhance their effective functioning as health-care professionals committed to life-long learning.

Significant advances in information technology have occurred since the early applications of drill-and-practice computer-aided instruction of two decades ago. Computer-based “interactive” programs can not only simulate living systems graphically but portray the consequences of a student’s intervention into the system. Computerized patients have the ability to survive an infinite number of student mistakes. More complex are computer-based systems that can be voice activated, and systems that model and adapt to the user’s cognitive style, providing moving and still images, texts, and graphics as aids to learning and tests of mastery.

Computer-based information systems are not limited to the formal years of instruction. Students will learn how to use technology to personally acquire, store, and manage information. Future health-care practitioners can be expected to make routine use of computer-based knowledge management systems that combine a number of information resources: clinical records; selective published knowledge; continuing self-education; and quality assurance review.

Recommendations: The 6 specific recommendations of the Board of Regents related to Health Professions Education concern:

- The role of NLM in developing prototype computer-based learning programs and in promoting awareness of such programs within the health education community; and
- The need for NLM to create a special program of grant support to develop prototype knowledge management systems for practitioners.

Resource Requirements

Although some of the activities contained within the report can be accomplished with existing resources, a number of the recommendations for achieving the Board's long range goals clearly are for advanced or expanded activities above and beyond NLM's current workload and commitments. Thus, while all are logical extensions of current activities, the majority will require additions to both NLM's fiscal appropriations and Full Time Equivalent personnel allocation in order to fulfill the responsibilities and opportunities identified in this plan.

The following budget tables present the Board's estimates of:

- Budgetary resources aggregated by domain;
- Effect of additional resources according to budget activities.

Board of Regents Planning Budget for the National Library of Medicine
FY 1986-FY 1990 by Domain
(Dollars in Thousands)

	1986 Actual			1987 Conference Allowance		
	Extramural	Intramural	Total	Extramural	Intramural	Total
Domains						
The NLM Collections	\$ —	\$17,243	\$17,243	\$ —	\$19,214	\$19,214
Access to the Literature	6,646	7,354	14,000	7,263	7,434	14,697
Factual Data Bases	357	2,540	2,897	400	3,437	3,837
Medical Informatics	5,251	3,250	8,501	6,567	3,680	10,247
Health Professions Education	—	2,976	2,976	—	3,100	3,100
Subtotal	12,254	33,363	45,617	14,230	36,865	51,095
Research Management and Support						
Extramural Management			1,316			1,473
Program Management			4,090			4,376
Subtotal			5,406			5,849
NIH Management Fund			4,250			4,894
Total, NLM			\$55,273			\$61,838

Board of Regents Estimate

1988			1989			1990		
Extramural	Intramural	Total	Extramural	Intramural	Total	Extramural	Intramural	Total
\$ —	\$22,859	\$22,859	\$ —	\$23,344	\$23,344	\$ —	\$23,314	\$23,314
13,763	10,819	24,582	14,763	11,689	26,452	15,763	12,709	28,472
400	16,192	16,592	400	16,192	16,592	400	16,192	16,592
20,467	9,230	29,697	25,017	11,430	36,447	29,612	14,230	43,842
5,250	5,200	10,540	3,500	5,200	8,700	3,650	4,950	8,600
39,880	64,300	104,180	43,680	67,855	111,535	49,425	71,395	120,820
		1,723			1,723			1,723
		4,526			4,526			4,526
		6,249			6,249			6,249
		4,894			4,894			4,894
		\$115,323			\$122,678			\$131,963

Board of Regents Planning Budget for the National Library of Medicine
FY 1986–FY 1990 by Budget Activity
(Dollars in Thousands)

	1986 Actual	1987 Conference Allowance	FTEs	Board of Regents Estimate			FTEs
				1988	1989	1990	
Extramural Programs							
Medical Library Assistance	\$7,530	\$9,410		\$22,410	\$21,910	\$23,310	
Medical Informatics	4,724	4,820		17,470	21,770	26,115	
Subtotal	12,254	14,230		39,880	43,680	49,425	
Intramural Programs*							
Library Operations	25,384	27,791	304	33,746	35,076	36,041	322
Lister Hill Center	8,915	10,386	78	20,861	23,086	25,661	120
Toxicology Information Program	3,314	3,582	31	4,867	4,867	4,867	42
Biotechnology Information	—	—	—	9,720	9,720	9,720	34
Subtotal	37,613	41,759	413	69,194	72,749	76,289	518
Research Management and Support							
Extramural Management	1,316	1,473	19	1,723	1,723	1,723	24
Program Management	4,090	4,376	72	4,526	4,526	4,526	75
Subtotal	5,406	5,849	91	6,249	6,249	6,249	99
Total, NLM	\$55,273	\$61,838	504	\$115,323	\$122,678	\$131,963	617

*Includes NIH Management Fund

NLM Planning Process

Statement involves many organizations and individuals. NLM has a major role in this process, but the goal and responsibility for the process are shared. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

The planning process also involved participation within the library. The Board has an interest in the process, but the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

At the end of the planning process, each party formulated recommendations and priorities for the future. NLM provided information and support for the process. The process was a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

The Board has an interest in the process, but the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

The Board has an interest in the process, but the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

The Board has an interest in the process, but the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

In January 1979, the National Library of Medicine (NLM) began a long-range planning process. The process was a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

The Board has an interest in the process, but the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

The Board has an interest in the process, but the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

The Board has an interest in the process, but the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process. The process is a long-range planning process, and while the Board has an interest, the process is not a Board process.

In January, 1985 the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine resolved to develop a long range plan to guide the Library in wisely using its human, physical, and financial resources to fulfill its mission. The Board recognized the need for a well-formulated plan because of rapidly evolving information technology, continued growth in the literature of biomedicine, and the need to make informed choices of intermediate objectives that would lead NLM toward its strategic, long range goals. Not only would a good plan generate goals and checkpoints for management, actually a map of program directions, but it would also inform the various constituencies among the Library's users about the future it sought and could help to enlist their support in achieving that future.

At the Board's direction, a broadly based process was begun involving the participation of librarians, physicians, nurses, and other health professionals; biomedical scientists; computer scientists; and others whose interests are intertwined with the Library's. A total of 77 experts in various fields accepted invitations to serve on one of the five planning panels. Each panel addressed the future in one of the five domains that encompass NLM's current programs and activities. The domains, which provided the panels a framework for thinking about the future are:

1. Building and organizing the Library's collection
2. Locating and gaining access to medical and scientific literature
3. Obtaining factual information from data bases
4. Medical informatics
5. Assisting health professions education through information technology

The Library chose a planning model with three components. First, it incorporates a general, somewhat indistinct vision of the future 20 years from now in medicine, library and information science, and computer-communications technology. That environment cannot be forecast precisely, but we can speak of a "distant" goal. That goal is seen as a societal objective whose

attainment involves many organizations and agencies. NLM has a major role to play in achieving the goal and must plan its part. Second, while the 20-year goals are indistinct, there are opportunities for and impediments to achieving them. The opportunities and impediments can be more clearly envisioned because they appear to lie roughly 10 years away. Third, the specific steps that should be taken to remove the impediments and take advantage of the opportunities should be programmed for 3 to 5 years.

The planning process also involved participation within the Library. The Director provided his version of the future in the form of a "Scenario: 2005," which was distributed to panel members and Library staff. NLM staff prepared background documents that reported NLM achievements in the five domains, and reviewed current planning. Senior NLM staff members also acted as resource persons to the planning panels.

At the end of the planning process, each panel formulated recommendations and priorities for future NLM programs and activities in the domain under its purview. The five panel reports were reviewed by the Board of Regents in June 1986. The Board then asked the NLM staff to analyze and reconcile their findings, eliminating any duplications and consolidating the recommendations. Together with the planning panel reports, this synthesized plan presents the official Long Range Plan of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine.

Participants in The Long Range Planning Process

Board of Regents of The National Library of Medicine, 1985—1986

Appointed Members

Chairmen

L. Thompson Bowles, M.D., Ph.D.

(Term: 1982—1986, Chair: 1985—1986)

Dean for Academic Affairs

Professor of Surgery

The George Washington University

Medical Center

Washington, D.C.

Albert E. Gunn, M.D.

(Term: 1983—1987, Chair: 1986—1987)

Associate Dean for Admissions

The University of Texas Medical School
at Houston

Medical Director

Rehabilitation Center

University of Texas/M.D. Anderson

Hospital and Tumor Institute

Houston, Texas

Members

Edward N. Brandt, Jr., M.D., Ph.D.

(1985—1989)

Chancellor

University of Maryland at Baltimore

Baltimore, Maryland

H. Robert Cathcart

(1986—1990)

President

Pennsylvania Hospital

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Lois E. DeBakey, Ph.D.

(1982—1986)

Professor of Scientific Communication

Baylor College of Medicine

Houston, Texas

Shirley Echelman, M.L.S.

(1981—1985)

Executive Director

Association of Research Libraries

Washington, D.C.

Edward A. Feigenbaum, Ph.D.

(1986—1990)

Professor of Computer Science

Stanford University

Stanford, California

Russell L. Fenwick

(1984—1988)

Senior Vice President (Retired)

Bank of America

Novato, California

John K. Lopez, M.B.A.

(1983—1987)

President

Medical Electrobiological Diagnostic

Sciences

Stanford, California

Nina W. Matheson, M.L.

(1986—1990)

Director

William H. Welch Medical Library

Johns Hopkins University

School of Medicine

Baltimore, Maryland

David O. Moline, D.D.S.

(1982—1986)

Assistant Professor of Dentistry

University of Iowa

Iowa City, Iowa

Ann K. Randall, D.L.S.

(1985—1989)

Professor and Chief Librarian

The City College of CUNY

New York, New York

Grant V. Rodkey, M.D.

(1984—1988)

Associate Clinical Professor of Surgery

Harvard Medical School

Boston, Massachusetts

Eugene A. Stead, Jr., M.D.

(1984—1988)

Professor Emeritus of Medicine

Duke University

Durham, North Carolina

Ex Officio Members

Primary

Quinn H. Becker, Lt. Gen., MC, USA

(1985—)

The Surgeon General
Department of the Army
Washington, D.C.

Alternate

Howard E. Fauver, Col., MC, USA

(1985—)

Chief, Graduate Medical Education Branch
Education and Training Division
U.S. Army Medical Department
Washington, D.C.

Primary

Daniel J. Boorstin, Litt.D.

(1975—)

Librarian of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Alternate

William J. Welsh, LL.D.

(1975—)

Deputy Librarian of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Primary

**Murphy A. Chesney, Lt. Gen.,
USAF, MC**

(1985—)

Surgeon General
Department of the Air Force
Washington, D.C.

Alternates

**Thomas P. Ball, Jr., Brig. Gen.,
USAF, MC**

(1985—1986)

Commander
Malcolm Grow Medical Center
Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland

**James G. Sanders, Brig. Gen.,
USAF, MC**

(1986—)

Commander
Malcolm Grow Medical Center
Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland

Primaries

John W. Ditzler, M.D.

(1984—1986)

Chief Medical Director
Department of Medicine and Surgery
Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C.

John Gronvall, M.D.

(1986—)

Acting Chief Medical Director
Department of Medicine and Surgery
Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C.

Alternates

James M. Hahn, M.L.S.

(1979—1986)

Director
Continuing Education Resources
Services
Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C.

Karen Renninger, M.L.S.

(1986—)

Chief
Library Division
Veterans Administration
Washington, D.C.

Primary

Joseph H. Howard, M.L.S.

(1985—)

Director
National Agricultural Library
U. S. Department of Agriculture
Beltsville, Maryland

Primary

David T. Kingsbury, Ph.D.

(1984—)

Assistant Director for Biological,
Behavioral, and Social Sciences
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C.

Alternate

Charles N. Brownstein, Ph.D.

(1985—)

Directorate for Computer and
Information Science and Engineering
National Science Foundation
Washington, D.C.

Primary

C. Everett Koop, M.D.

(1981—)

Surgeon General

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health

U.S. Public Health Service

Washington, D.C.

Alternate

Faye G. Abdellah, Ed.D., Sc.D.

(1972—)

Deputy Surgeon General

Chief Nurse Officer

U.S. Public Health Service

Rockville, Maryland

Primary

Jay P. Sanford, M.D.

(1985—)

Dean

Uniformed Services University

of the Health Sciences

F. Edward Hebert School of Medicine

Bethesda, Maryland

Primary

Lewis H. Seaton, Vice Adm.,

MC, USN

(1983—)

Surgeon General

Office of the Chief of Naval Operations

Department of the Navy

Washington, D.C.

Alternates

Noel Dysart, Capt., MC, USN

(1984—1986)

Assistant for Professional Training

Office of the Chief of Naval Operations

Department of the Navy

Washington, D.C.

Mark Jacobs, Cmdr., MC, USN

(1986—)

Assistant for Professional Training

Office of the Chief of Naval Operations

Department of the Navy

Washington, D.C.

Executive Secretary

Donald A. B. Lindberg, M.D.

Director

National Library of Medicine

Bethesda, Maryland

Special Consultants

William O. Baker, Ph.D.

Chairman of the Board (Emeritus)

AT&T Bell Telephone Laboratories

Murray Hill, New Jersey

James Barger, M.D.

President

American College of Pathology

Sunrise Hospital

Las Vegas, Nevada

Robert Braude, M.L.S., Ph.D.

Assistant Dean for Information

Resources

Cornell University Medical College

Library

New York, New York

Morris F. Collen, M.D.

Department of Medical Methods Research

The Permanente Medical Group

Oakland, California

Jay Goldman, Sc.D.

Dean

School of Engineering

University of Alabama at Birmingham

Birmingham, Alabama

George Kozmetsky, Ph.D.

RGK Foundation

Austin, Texas

Donald W. King, M.D.

Dean and Vice President

Pritzker School of Medicine

University of Chicago

Chicago, Illinois

Jack D. Myers, M.D.

Professor of Medicine

School of Medicine

University of Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Anthony Oettinger, Ph.D.

Director
Center for Information Resources Policy
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

The Honorable Paul Rogers, LL.D.

Hogan and Hartson
Washington, D.C.

Edward H. Shortliffe, M.D., Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Medicine and
Computer Science
Department of Medicine
Stanford University Medical Center
Stanford, California

William J. Welsh, LL.D.

Deputy Librarian of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Panel Members

**Building and Organizing the
Library's Collection**

Chairperson

Robert M. Hayes, Ph.D.

Dean
Graduate School of Library and
Information Science
University of California at
Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Members

Henriette D. Avram, Sc.D.

Assistant Librarian for Processing
Services
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Patricia Battin, M.L.S.

Vice-President and University Librarian
Columbia University
New York, New York

Howard L. Bleich, M.D.

Associate Professor of Medicine
Harvard Medical School
Beth Israel Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

Gert H. Brieger, M.D., Ph.D.

William H. Welch Professor
Director, Institute of the History of
Medicine
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Alison Bunting, M.L.S.

Biomedical Librarian
Center for the Health Sciences
University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

Mary E. Corning, D.Sc.

Norwich, Connecticut

Nicholas E. Davies, M.D.

Chairman
Department of Medicine
Piedmont Hospital
Atlanta, Georgia

Michael E. DeBakey, M.D.

Chancellor
Chairman, Department of Surgery
Baylor College of Medicine
Houston, Texas

Alfred P. Fishman, M.D.

Director
Cardiovascular-Pulmonary Division
Hospital of the University of
Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Edward J. Huth, M.D.

Editor
Annals of Internal Medicine
American College of Physicians
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Judith Messerle, M.S.L.S.

Director
Medical Center Library
St. Louis University Medical Center
St. Louis, Missouri

Raymond A. Palmer, M.S.L.S.

Executive Director
Medical Library Association
Chicago, Illinois

W. David Penniman, Ph.D.

Director
Libraries & Information Systems
AT&T Bell Laboratories
Murray Hill, New Jersey

Warren A. Sawyer, M.L.S.

Director
Libraries and Learning Resource Centers
Medical University of South Carolina
Charleston, South Carolina

NLM Staff

Rose Marie Woodsmall, M.L.S.

Executive Secretary

Betsy Humphreys, M.L.S.

Resource Person

**Locating and Gaining Access to
Medical and Scientific
Information**

Chairperson

Nancy W. Lorenzi, Ph.D.

Associate Senior Vice President
University of Cincinnati Medical Center
Cincinnati, Ohio

Members

Douglas Brutlag, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Biochemistry
Stanford University Medical Center
Stanford, California

Cyril Feng, M.S.L.S.

Director
Health Science Library
University of Maryland
Baltimore, Maryland

Hugh Harroff, Jr., D.V.M.

Veterinarian
Battelle Memorial Institute
Columbus, Ohio

Mary M. Horres, M.S.L.S.

Biomedical Librarian
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California

James Isbister, M.A.

Senior Vice President
Blue Cross/Blue Shield Association
Washington, D.C.

Allan M. Kulakow, Ph.D.

Director
African Programs
Academy for Educational Development,
Inc.
Washington, D.C.

Gertrude Lamb, Ph.D.

Director
Health Science Libraries
Hartford Hospital
Hartford, Connecticut

George Lundberg, M.D.

Editor
Journal of the American Medical
Association
Chicago, Illinois

Richard Reitemeier, M.D.

Professor
Mayo Clinic and Mayo Medical School
Rochester, Minnesota

Patricia Schwirian, Ph.D., R.N.

Director
Office of Information Management
Services
College of Nursing
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Robert Wedgeworth, M.L.S.

Dean
School of Library Science
Columbia University
New York, New York

Martha Williams, M.A.

Professor of Information Science
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

NLM Staff

Susan Buyer Slater, M.A.

Executive Secretary

Lois Ann Colaianne, M.L.S.

Resource Person

John E. Anderson, M.S.

Resource Person

Obtaining Factual Information from Data Bases

Chairperson

Ruth Davis, Ph.D.

President
Pymatuning Group, Inc.
Arlington, Virginia

Members

Rachael Anderson, M.S.

Health Sciences Librarian
Columbia University
New York, New York

David H. Brandin

President
Strategic Technologies, Inc.
Los Altos Hills, California

James Burrows

Director
Institute for Computer Science &
Technology
National Bureau of Standards
Gaithersburg, Maryland

Robert Lee Chartrand, M.A.

Senior Specialist in Information Policy
and Technology
Congressional Research Service
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Peter Friedland, Ph.D.

Senior Research Associate
Knowledge Systems Laboratory
Stanford University
Palo Alto, California

Robert E. Kahn, Ph.D.

Consultant
Information Processing Techniques
Office
Advanced Research Projects Agency
Department of Defense
Arlington, Virginia

Joshua Lederberg, Ph.D.

President
Rockefeller University
New York, New York

Robert U. Massey, M.D.

Dean
University of Connecticut
School of Medicine
Farmington, Connecticut

Daniel R. Masys, M.D.

Chief
International Cancer Research Data
Bank
National Cancer Institute
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Allan M. Maxam, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Biological
Chemistry
Harvard Medical School
Dana-Farber Cancer Institute
Boston, Massachusetts

Gerard Piel, D.Sc.

Chairman of the Board
Scientific American
New York, New York

Richard J. Roberts, Ph.D.

Senior Scientist
Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory
Cold Spring Harbor, New York

Elmer V. Smith

Director
Canada Institute for Scientific and
Technical Information
National Research Council
Ottawa, Canada

Willis Ware, Ph.D.

Corporate Research Staff
The Rand Corporation
Santa Monica, California

Ronald L. Wigington, Ph.D.

Director
Chemical Abstracts Service
Washington, D.C.

NLM Staff

Sean P. Donohue, M.P.A.

Executive Secretary

Henry M. Kissman, Ph.D.

Resource Person

Medical Informatics

Chairperson

Edward H. Shortliffe, M.D., Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Medicine and Computer Science
Department of Medicine
Stanford University Medical Center
Stanford, California

Members

J. Robert Beck, M.D.

Assistant Professor of Pathology and Community and
Family Medicine
Director
Program in Medical Information Science
Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center
Hanover, New Hampshire

Marsden S. Blois, M.D., Ph.D.

Professor and Chairman
Section on Medical Information Science
University of California-San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Robert Braude, M.L.S., Ph.D.

Assistant Dean for Information
Resources
Cornell University Medical College
Library
New York, New York

Milton Corn, M.D.

Dean
School of Medicine
Georgetown University
Washington, D.C.

Arthur Elstein, Ph.D.

Professor of Health Professions Education
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Dennis Fryback, Ph.D.

Professor of Industrial Engineering and Preventive
Medicine
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Nina W. Matheson, M.L.

Director
William H. Welch Medical Library
The Johns Hopkins University
School of Medicine
Baltimore, Maryland

Clement J. McDonald, M.D.

Professor of Medicine
School of Medicine
Indiana University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Judy G. Ozbolt, Ph.D., R.N.

Associate Professor
Center for Nursing Research
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ramesh Patil, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor
Laboratory for Computer Science
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Stephen G. Pauker, M.D.

Associate Professor of Medicine
School of Medicine
Tufts University
Boston, Massachusetts

Thomas Rindfleisch

Director
Knowledge Systems Laboratory
Stanford University Medical Center
Stanford, California

Donald A. Senhauser, M.D.

Chairman
Department of Pathology
Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio

Homer Warner, M.D., Ph.D.

Professor and Chairman
Department of Medical Informatics
School of Medicine
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Bonnie Webber, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
Department of Computer and
Information Science
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

NLM Staff

Peter Clepper
Executive Secretary

Harold M. Schoolman, M.D.
Resource Person

Earl Henderson, M.S.E.E.
Resource Person

**Assisting Health Professions
Education Through
Information Technology**

Chairperson

G. Octo Barnett, M.D.
Professor of Medicine
Harvard Medical School
Massachusetts General Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

Members

Phillip C. Anderson, M.D.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Dermatology
University of Missouri School of
Medicine
Columbia, Missouri

Marion Ball, Ed.D.
Director, Academic Computing
Associate Vice Chancellor, Information
Resources Management (Ad Interim)
University of Maryland at Baltimore
Baltimore, Maryland

Richard Friedman, M.D.
Vice Chairman
Department of Medicine
University of Wisconsin Medical School
Madison, Wisconsin

Paul F. Griner, M.D.
General Director
Strong Memorial Hospital
Director
University of Rochester Medical Center
Rochester, New York

Edithe J. Levit, M.D.
President and Chief Executive Officer
National Board of Medical Examiners
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Phil R. Manning, M.D.
Associate Vice President
Associate Dean for Postgraduate
Education
University of Southern California School
of Medicine
Los Angeles, California

Victor Neufeld, M.D.,
Associate Dean (Education)
Faculty of Health Sciences
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

Gerald J. Oppenheimer, M.A., M.S.
Director
Health Sciences Library & Information
Center
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Sholom Pearlman, D.D.S.
Denver, Colorado

Thomas Piemme, M.D.
Assistant Dean for Continuing Medical
Education
George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

Barbara Redman, Ph.D.
Executive Director
American Association of Colleges of
Nursing
Washington, D.C.

M. Roy Schwarz, M.D.
Assistant Executive Vice President for
Medical Education and Science
American Medical Association
Chicago, Illinois

John N. Sheagren, M.D.
Associate Dean
University of Michigan Medical School
Ann Arbor, Michigan

John F. Sherman, Ph.D.
Vice President
Association of American Medical
Colleges
Washington, D.C.

Consultants to the Planning Panels

Edward J. Stemmler, M.D.

Dean
University of Pennsylvania
School of Medicine
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Marjorie Wilson, M.D.

Senior Associate Dean
University of Maryland
School of Medicine
Baltimore, Maryland

NLM Staff

Elliot R. Siegel, Ph.D.

Executive Secretary

William G. Cooper, Ph.D.

Resource Person

John A. Starkweather, Ph.D.

Resource Person

Stephen Abrahamson, Ph.D.

Director
Department of Research and Medical
Education
School of Medicine
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

James Adelstein, M.D.

Dean of Academic Affairs
Harvard Medical School
Boston, Massachusetts

Anthony R. Aguirre, M.L.S., M.S.

Director
Library of the College of Physicians of
Philadelphia
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Col. Andrew Aines, M.A.

U.S. Army, Retired
Springfield, Virginia

Nicholas A. Alter

Vice President
Electronic Publishing
University Microfilms International
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Ralph D. Arcari, M.S., M.A.

Director
Central Educational Services and
Director, Library
The University of Connecticut
Health Center
Farmington, Connecticut

W. Gerald Austen, M.D.

Edward D. Churchill Professor of
Surgery
Chief of Surgical Services
Massachusetts General Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

David Bishop, M.S. (L.S.)

University Librarian
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco, California

Naomi C. Broering, M.L.S., M.A.

Director
Dahlgren Memorial Library
Georgetown University Medical Center
Washington, D.C.

Bruce G. Buchanan, Ph.D.

Professor of Computer Science
Stanford University
Stanford, California

**Holly Shipp Buchanan, M.Ln.,
M.B.A.**

Director
Corporate Information Resources
NKC Hospitals, Inc.
Louisville, Kentucky

William D. Carey

Executive Officer
American Association for the
Advancement of Science
Washington, D.C.

William G. Cooper, Ph.D.

Cooper and Associates
Houston, Texas

Paul R. DeRensis, J.D.

Chairman
Committee on Tort Liability for Use of
Computer Systems
American Bar Association
Boston, Massachusetts

Don E. Detmer, M.D.

Vice President for Health Sciences
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Leonard D. Fenninger, M.D.

Attending Physician
Northwestern Memorial Hospital
Chicago, Illinois

Stanley Foster, M.D.

Assistant Director
International Health Program Office
Centers for Disease Control
Atlanta, Georgia

Robert A. Greenes, M.D., Ph.D.

Radiologist and Director
Computer Science Division
Brigham & Women's Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

Susan J. Grobe, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Nursing
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas

Vincent F. Guinee, M.D.

Chairman, Department of Patient
Studies
Coordinator, International Cancer Patient
Data Exchange System
M.D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor
Institute
Houston, Texas

Warren J. Haas

President
Council on Library Resources
Washington, D.C.

Lillian Haddock, M.D.

Dean of Academic Affairs
Professor of Medicine
School of Medicine
University of Puerto Rico
San Juan, Puerto Rico

R. Brian Haynes, M.D.

Professor
Department of Clinical Epidemiology
and Biostatistics
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

Lawrence G. Hunsicker, M.D.

Associate Professor
Department of Internal Medicine
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Richard Janeway, M.D.

Vice President for Health Affairs
Dean
Bowman Gray School of Medicine
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Carol Jenkins, M.L.S.

Director
Health Sciences Library
University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Laurence H. Kedes, M.D.

Professor of Medicine
Stanford University School of Medicine
Stanford, California

Donald W. King, M.S.

President
King Research, Inc.
Rockville, Maryland

Robert B. Lanman, J.D.

Office of the General Counsel, DHHS
NIH Legal Advisor
National Institutes of Health
Bethesda, Maryland

Gwilym S. Lodwick, M.D.

Associate Radiologist
Harvard Medical School
Massachusetts General Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

Nelson Logan, D.D.S.

University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Richard Lyders, M.L.S.

Executive Director
Houston Academy of Medicine
Texas Medical Center Library
Houston, Texas

Kathleen A. McCormick, Ph.D.

Laboratory of Behavioral Sciences
Gerontology Research Center
National Institute of Aging
Baltimore, Maryland

Jean K. Miller

Director
Health Science Center at Dallas Library
University of Texas
Dallas, Texas

Randolph A. Miller, M.D.

Associate Professor of Medicine
School of Medicine
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Joyce A. Mitchell, Ph.D.

Director
Information Science Group
University of Missouri-Columbia
Columbia, Missouri

Allen Newell, Ph.D.

University Professor
Computer Science Department
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Miranda Lee Pao, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
School of Information and Library
Studies
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Robert D. Poling, J.D.

Specialist in American Public Law
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

Joseph F. Volker, D.D.S., Ph.D.

Professor
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Birmingham, Alabama

Malcolm S.M. Watts, M.D.

Associate Dean
University of California, San Francisco
San Francisco, California

William S. Yamamoto, M.D.

Professor and Chairman
Department of Computer Medicine
The George Washington University
Medical Center
Washington, D.C.

Rita Zielstorff, M.S.N.

Laboratory of Computer Science
Massachusetts General Hospital
Boston, Massachusetts

Additionally, the Board acknowledges with gratitude the following individuals and organizations:

Editorial Support:

Robert B. Mehnert
Chief, Office of Inquiries and
Publications Management
National Library of Medicine

Design and Layout:

Medical Arts and Photography Branch
Division of Research Services
National Institutes of Health

Secretarial assistance:

Zelda Arch
Wilma Bennice
Bette Sarni

Photographs were obtained from the several Bureaus, Institutes, and Divisions of the National Institutes of Health (including the Office of the Director, NIH, the Warren G. Magnuson Clinical Center, and the National Institute on Aging), the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, the World Health Organization, and William A. Yasnoff, M.D., Ph. D..

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE



NLM 00683042 3



January 1987